



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,305	07/29/2002	Rochus Jonas	MERCK 2396	2845

23599 7590 06/04/2003

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.  
SUITE 1400  
ARLINGTON, VA . 22201

EXAMINER

BERCH, MARK L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/070,305

Applicant(s)

JONAS ET AL.

Examiner

Mark L. Berch

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) Z. 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 (and 6 is this is a method claim) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for potency disorders, does not reasonably provide enablement for cardiovascular disorders generally. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Pursuant to *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), one considers the following factors to determine whether undue experimentation is required: (A) The breadth of the claims; (B) The nature of the invention; (C) The state of the prior art; (D) The level of one of ordinary skill; (E) The level of predictability in the art; (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor; (G) The existence of working examples; and (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. Some experimentation is not fatal; the issue is whether the amount of experimentation is “undue”; see *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1444.

Art Unit: 1624

The analysis is as follows:

(1) Breadth of claims.

(a) Scope of the compounds. Owing to the fairly wide range of X choices, and the large number of substituents, the genus covers millions of compounds.

(b) Scope of the diseases covered. Cardiovascular diseases embraces a vast array of problems, some of which are contradictory to others. This covers various forms of endocarditis, including Verrucous, Atypical verrucous (Libman-Sacks) Non-bacterial thrombotic - NBTE (marantic), bacterial, viral, and rickettsial endocarditis. It covers different forms of atresia, including tricuspid atresia without TGV, pulmonic valvular atresia and aortic atresia. It includes assorted cardiomyopathies, including restrictive cardiomyopathy, peripartum cardiomyopathy, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, and congenital cardiomyopathy. It embraces various forms of aortic Stenosis, including valvular aortic Stenosis, idiopathic hypertrophic sub-aortic stenosis (IHSS), subvalvular aortic stenosis, and supravalvular aortic stenosis. There are all kinds of miscellaneous syndromes, including subclavian steal syndrome, Eisenmenger syndrome, mitral valve prolapse (Barlow) syndrome, Aortic arch syndrome, scimitar syndrome, hypoplastic left heart syndrome, Lutembacher syndrome, and superior vena cava syndrome. It covers various forms of hypertension, including primary (idiopathic) pulmonary hypertension, neonatal pulmonary venous hypertension and pulmonary hypertension. It includes aortic aneurysms, including both thoracic and abdominal, as well as mycotic aneurysm. It covers various types of arrhythmias and atrial fibrillation. It covers elevated blood levels of triglycerides, of total cholesterol or of LDL cholesterol, and hyperlipoproteinaemias. It covers different forms of ischaemic heart disease including

Art Unit: 1624

congestive heart failure and myocardial infarction. It covers a vast array of structural defects such as atrial septal defect (ASD), aortopulmonary window, egg-on-its-side heart, gooseneck deformity, endocardial cushion defect, arc of Buehler, arc of Riolan, truncus arteriosus, Ebstein's Malformation, azygos continuation of interrupted IVC, Atrioventricular Canal, ventricular septal defect (VSD), abdominal aortic coarctation, aortic pseudo-coarctation, complete endocardial cushion defect, Hypoplastic Left Heart, patent ductus arteriosus (PDA), congenital absence of pulmonary valve, aortic coarctation partial endocardial cushion defect, Single Ventricle, box-like heart, pulmonary sling, Left Ventricle to Right Atrial Shunt, total anomalous pulmonary venous return (TAPVR), partial anomalous pulmonary venous return (PAPVR), and transposition of the great vessels. It covers certain peripheral vascular disorders, such as deep-vein thrombosis and thrombophlebitis and assorted cerebral vascular diseases including migraine. There is hypotension, which can arise from all sorts of other problems. All there is a huge collection of other cardiovascular problems, including thymoma (invasive and non-invasive), admixture lesion, left ventricular hypertrophy, tortuous aorta, aortic laceration pulmonary artery sarcoma, aortic regurgitation, pneumomediastinum (Spontaneous and traumatic), middle mediastinal mass, posterior mediastinal mass, Uhl disease, right ventricular hypertrophy, cardiac rhabdomyoma, acute aortic dissection, pericardial cyst, carotid artery bruit, pulmonary embolism, venous angioma, varicose veins and spider veins, congenital heart disease, pericardial effusion, tetralogy of Fallot, coronary artery calcification, endocardial fibroelastosis, fibromuscular dysplasia (FMD), thromboangiitis obliterans (Buerger disease), left or

Art Unit: 1624

right ventricular volume overload, Takayasu arteritis, situs inversus, neonatal heart failure, myocarditis, arteriosclerosis, atherosclerosis, stroke and many others.

(2) The nature of the invention and predictability in the art: The invention is directed toward medicine and is therefore physiological in nature. It is well established that “the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved,” and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

(3) Direction or Guidance: That provided is very limited. The dosage range information provided on page 13 is completely generic as to disease. That is, it in effect provides the same dosage for any of dozens of disorders.

(4) State of the Prior Art: The invention provides for certain types of benzylamino pyrazolo[4,3-d]pyrimidines. So far as the examiner is aware, not benzylamino pyrazolo[4,3-d]pyrimidines have been used for any of these disorders.

(5) Working Examples: There are no working examples to the treatment of any disorder. Indeed, the specification provides no biological data whatsoever.

(6) Skill of those in the art: The skill level in the art of pharmacological treatment of cardiovascular disorders varies with the disorder. In some areas such as hypertension it is relatively high. But in the great majority of cases it is very low as the disorders cannot

be treated with pharmaceuticals. The vast majority are treated either by surgical means or cannot be treated at all, leaving only general management of symptoms.

(7) The quantity of experimentation needed: Owing to factors (1), (3) and (6), the quantity of experimentation is expected to be high.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the compounds and salts, does not reasonably provide enablement for solvates. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The dozens of examples presented all failed to produce a solvate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ... no evidence that such

Art Unit: 1624

compounds even exist.” The same circumstance appears to be true here: there is no evidence that solvates of these compounds actually exist; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, applicants must show that solvates can be made, or limit the claims accordingly.

Claims 1 and 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. The “medicaments” of claim 7 is unclear. IS this intended as a compound claim or a composition claim?
2. Species (c) in claim 2 is not written correctly. The dashes and surrounding brackets must be removed.
3. A complete and proper composition claim must recite a carrier, otherwise it is just a compound claim. Thus, claim 5 needs a carrier. If claim 7 is intended as a composition, the same is true.
4. R5, and the second choice for R6, are divalent, but are required to be monovalent because of the fact that X is a monovalent radical.
5. The term, “for use ....” in claim 6 simply states an intention, which is a mental step, not a patentable limitation. Hence the claim is improperly dependent, as it does not further limit the claim 1 on which it depends. Alternatively, this may be intended as a method of use claim, in which case, the claim is garbled, as it begins as a compound claim, and ends as a method claim. The same issue arises in claim 7.
6. Claim 8 provides for the use of the compound, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process



Art Unit: 1624

applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark L. Berch whose telephone number is 703-308-4718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 - 3:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah can be reached on 308-4716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 708-308-1235.

Application/Control Number: 10/070,305

Page 9

Art Unit: 1624

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark L. Berch". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mark L. Berch  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1624

June 2, 2003